

REMARKS

Applicant submits that there is antecedent basis in claim 1 for "the entire width of the carriage" such that no further amendment is required. However if the Examiner disagrees, amend "the entire" to --an entire--.

The Examiner's rejections of claims 1, 5 and 8-10 under 35 USC § 102(e) for being anticipated by Yamamoto et al. US Patent No. 6,712,007 or under 35 USC § 103(a) for being unpatentable over Yamamoto in view of Schindler et al. US Patent No. 6,820,759, are respectfully traversed.

In support of this traverse, applicant points out that claim 1 now has been amended to include the subject matter of claim 2 which was found to contain allowable subject matter. Further, Yamamoto et al. does not show a central cutout with centering surfaces that are provided with horizontal fixing surfaces but merely a simple cutout to create space for the coupler of the car (US 6,712,007 B2, column 3, line 55). Additionally, Schindler et al. neither shows nor suggests a central cutout with the features of the claimed invention, but merely an anti-climber device which combines a conventional bumper with a shock absorbing zone. Consequently, a person skilled in the art would not combine the features of Yamamoto and Schindler and would not come to the same conclusion as the claimed invention.

In summary, Applicant submits that the claims are now in condition for allowance and an early and favorable action to that end is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

PLYLE & PIONTEK, LLC

September 17, 2009

By: Thomas R. Vigil
Thomas R. Vigil, Reg. 24,542
Attorney for Applicant

Thomas R. Vigil, Esq.

Attorney for Applicant

Thomas R. Vigil, Esq.
PYLE & PIONTEK, LLC
221 N. LaSalle St. – Suite 1207
Chicago, ILLINOIS 60601

Tel: 312/236-8123
Fax: 312/236-5574